



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,880	08/28/2003	Joseph Sheinis	5681-64700	8735
35690	7590	02/26/2007	EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. 700 LAVACA, SUITE 800 AUSTIN, TX 78701			SEYE, ABDOU K	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2194

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/650,880	SHEINIS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Abdou Karim Seye	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2007.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 01/05/2007; 08/28/2003 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

ed.  
  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_ . 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on January 05, 2007 has been received and entered. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-28.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881)**.

Claim 1, Granade, teaches a system, comprising: an application server (fig. 1/112) comprising: an application component whose data is represented in a system default locale (fig. 2/203; paragraph 75); localization logic configured to translate input parameters or return values between the system default locale and another locale (fig. 2/202; paragraph 42, 50 and 62); and interception logic configured to intercept a plurality of method calls to the application component (fig. 2/102; back end application); wherein the interception logic is

configured to invoke the localization logic and the application component in response to one or more of the plurality of method calls (paragraph 50 and 63; invoking the integration manager application passing resulting information produced to the mobile device).

Claim 2, Granade teaches,

wherein the localization logic is separate from the application component (fig. 2/203 and 202 are separated).

Claim 3, Granade teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to operate on data stored in a primary database table in which the data is represented in the system default locale (fig. 2/210 paragraph 37).

Claim 4, Granade teaches,

wherein the application component is configured to invoke one or more Java Data Base Connectivity methods to maintain the primary database table; the claimed element "java" in (paragraph 42) of grenade reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

Claim 5, Granade teaches, wherein the localization logic is configured to operate on data stored in one or more localization database tables in which the data is represented in a locale other than the system default locale (fig. 2/102; paragraph 26 and 36).

As per claim 6, it is rejected in the same reasons as claim 4 above.

Claim 7, Granade teaches, wherein the interception logic includes one or more dynamic proxies that are configured to intercept application component method calls before the execution of the method (paragraph 37).

Claim 10, Granade teaches, a metadata file indicating the system default locale and translatable table information for the application component (paragraph 38).

As per claims 11,12, 13 15,16,17,18 and 19 , they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

As per claims 20, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881) in view of Upton (20030110315)**.

Claims 8 and 14, Granade teaches a localization unit that includes methods as in claim 1 above, wherein these method could be written in java (paragraph 42), but he does not explicitly discloses,

wherein the localization logic is configured to make one or more Java reflection calls to determine whether input parameters to, or return values from the application component are localizable. However, in the same field of endeavor, Upton discloses a JSP templates that can leverage the internationalization and localization feature of the java platform (paragraph 99) and the use of java API reflection to determine methods to invoke on a request (paragraph 81 and 121).

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Granade's invention with Upton's invention to include java reflection API within the localization logic to make java refection calls to determine whether input parameters to, or return values from the application component are localizable, because it would greatly simplify the interaction with the back end database resources

for methods call and the return values. One would have been motivated to include Java reflection API in an integrated system with web access to the back end systems in order to get and set the value of an object's field such as local data, even if the field name is unknown to your program until runtime. Therefore to get fast information retrieval from storage area.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881)** in view of **Graham et al. (20020046240)**.

Claim 9, Granade teaches a localization logic as in claim 1 above, but he does not explicitly discloses,

wherein the localization logic configured to invoke localization functions before and after the execution of the method. However, in the same field of endeavor, Graham discloses a "GetLocale ()" method to determine a user's current locale (paragraph 34) and a logic methods to validate and process the fields before and after invoking the execution of the method (paragraph 67, 68, 82, 83 and 84). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Granade's invention with Graham's invention to include a localization logic configured to invoke localization functions before and after the execution of the method, because it would help reduce user errors when accessing data in a storage area. One would have been motivated to use a validation method within a localization function in order provide users of client /server environment a redisplay of localized error message associated

with input fields saved, so the user does not have to re-enter any valid information.

Therefore to improve efficiency of the overall system.

As per claims 21-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed January 05, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Claim 1 Applicant argues that, “Grenade fails to teach interception logic configured to intercept a plurality of method calls to the application component, Wherein the interception logic is configured to invoke the localization logic in response to one or more of the plurality of method calls”. Grenade teaches in (paragraph 50 and 63) the step of invoking the integration manager (localization logic) passing resulting information produced to the mobile device. This middleware sitting between the interception logic (backend systems) and the front end application is always invoked during client request and response for access to data based information. Therefore Grenade's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

b. Claim 11, Applicant argues that “Grenade fails to teach a method comprising creating a dynamic proxy for an application component comprising one or more

localizable parameters or return values". Grenade teaches in paragraph 37 having a localization proxy server for providing service to a mobile device interface with local variable in the application. Therefore Granade's reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.

c. Claim 12 see rejections of claim 8 above.

d. Claim 9, see rejection of claim 9 above.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Latvakoski et al (20040153548) discloses a configuration method and system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Art Unit: 2194

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

AKS  
February, 16 2007

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
William Thomson  
Supervisory Patent Examiner